

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
(Additional Counsel are listed on Signature Page)

MICHAEL BRAUCH, a resident of San Francisco, and ANDREW MEIMES, a resident of New York, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,)	CASE NO. C:05-2743 SC
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTION OR PROCEEDING

Pursuant to Civ. Local Rule 3-13, plaintiffs Michael Brauch and Andrew Meimes (“Plaintiffs”) identify the following cases in which substantially similar antitrust law violations are alleged to have occurred due to Intel Corporation’s (“Intel”) use of its substantial market power to unlawfully maintain its monopoly by engaging in a relentless campaign to coerce customers to refrain from dealing with Advanced Micro Devices, which resulted in customers paying higher prices for x86 microprocessors and left them with fewer buying choices for such microprocessors.

Each of the following cases therefore relates to the general subject matter alleged in this action.

1. *Ambruoso v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00505, filed in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware on July 20, 2005. This action has not been assigned to a judge as of the date of this filing.
2. *Baran v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00508, filed in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware on July 20, 2005. This action has not been assigned to a judge as of the date of this filing.
3. *Czysz v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00509, filed in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware on July 20, 2005. This action has not been assigned to a judge as of the date of this filing.
4. *Ludt v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00510, filed in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware on July 20, 2005. This action has not been assigned to a judge as of the date of this filing.

On July 11, 2005, Plaintiffs filed a motion with the Judicial Panel for Multidistrict Litigation, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407, requesting that all pending and subsequently filed actions in this and other district courts be transferred and coordinated or consolidated in the Northern District of California for pretrial proceedings. A copy of that motion was lodged with the clerk of court on July 11, 2005. The Plaintiffs believe that coordination of the foregoing cases pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407 (Multi-District Litigation

Procedures) will avoid conflicts, conserve resources and promote an efficient determination of the action.

Dated: July 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Alex C. Turan
Michael P. Lehmann
Thomas P. Dove
Alex C. Turan
The Furth Firm, LLP
225 Bush Street, 15th Floor
San Francisco, California 94104-4249
Telephone: (415) 433-2070
Facsimile: (415) 982-2076

Francis O. Scarpulla (41059)
Law Offices Of Francis O. Scarpulla
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 788-7210
Facsimile: (415) 788-0707

Craig C. Corbitt (83251)
Zelle Hofmann Voelbel Mason & Gette, LLP
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 693-0700
Facsimile: (415) 693-0770

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Michael Brauch and
Andrew Meimes